

INV Training itinerary

Use of the Self-Observation Protocol (new version)

FCSD

Frequency

The 13 participating professionals were asked to use the new version of the tool between July and the end of September 2014. In July, we had 12 participants left, but one drop-out (who left end of June) had informed that she wanted to be back in the testing (the person she worked with had returned to the service) so we had 13 professionals.

The volume of received protocols has been rather low. Only 6 persons sent us their self-observations. Some of them filled in the first part of the new protocol just once before completing the second part, others gathered two or three situations before filling in the second part. One person didn't complete this last part.

The number of received protocols is shown in next table:

	First part of the new protocol	Second part of the new protocol
Nr.of protocols	13	5

The reason for the low rate of response can be, on the one hand, the summer holidays. In Spain these holidays can last from July until the second half of September. In fact, two professionals had informed that the person they worked with wouldn't come back from summer holidays until that time.

On the other hand, the period in which the testing had to be made was one of high workload for the professionals who were just back from holidays. This was the feedback of some of them when asked.

Accuracy

We get the impression that filling in the new version of the protocol has been easier for the professionals. They are still brief in their answers, but they are accurate.

Nevertheless, we think they continue having some difficulty with the questions that relate to theoretical concepts included in the model: question 4 (homologation, demonization, normalization) and 5 (the enemies of the relationship). During the second national training, the participants were asked about this issue and most of them admitted that they didn't really understand them or that they had difficulties applying them to the reflection.

Another aspect to take into account is the number of copies of PART I that they have filled in before completing the second part. Some professionals, when making the more thorough reflection in part II they say that they need more situations of part I to compare before giving an answer.

Events recorded

The recorded events continue being different kinds of situations, those with negative or difficult elements (inactivity or lack of response of the person with disability, negative reactions to proposals made by the professional...), and those with a more positive, happy or successful elements (positive unexpected reactions of the person with id, new achievements of the person ...).

As in previous reports, the events recorded are about situations that occur in a context of daily life and "informal" learning routines or in "formal" learning situations.

Results

We think that, to have a real impression of the usefulness of this new version of the protocol, it would have been necessary that professionals completed the second part of it after gathering a minimum number of situations of emotional intensity. One or two situations isn't enough. In fact, during the second national training, one of the feedbacks was that professionals think we should specify a minimum number of first parts to be filled

in before completing Part 2 of the protocol.

In any case, our impression is that the participants have had less difficulty filling in this new version of the tool than the initial one, except for the questions mentioned above (4 and 5).

Although two of the 9 professionals that participated in the second national training prefer the old version of the tool (because, among others, they find it nicer to write out the answers to the questions), dividing the protocol in two parts has been valued as a positive thing. In the annex of this report we attach the feedback (in short words) that has been given during the training to each tool (initial and renewed version).

We think that gathering different situations of emotional intensity and afterwards making a more thorough reflection, allows them to get a global vision of one's own emotional patterns, while making the reflection about individual situations (like in the initial version), if it's not done regularly, doesn't have this effect.

From the comments made by the 9 professionals that participated in the second national training, we conclude that using the tool has helped most of them to create a space for reflection on their emotions and on how these influence their pedagogical relationship. As you can read in the subjective evaluation included in the annex, some of them report changes in the way they behave in front of the person or in how they see him/her.

ANNEX 1

EVALUATION OF THE TOOLS. Positive and negative aspects

INITIAL TOOL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEUTRAL
<i>What happened? And What do I feel?:</i> Very good questions	Question 5: Oh no!!!	Experimental
The <i>evaluation</i> and <i>What did I learn?</i> Good questions	Too much open questions (2x)	
Complete	Complicated (2x)	
Educational	Confusing (2x)	
The most positive: shearing it with the team	Repetitive	
Interesting	Excessive	
Different	Tiresome (4x)	
Innovative	It makes you turn around the situation many times	
New	It takes long to fill it in	
	The theoretical reflection is useless	
	No clear objective	
	Too long (2x)	

RENEWED TOOL

POSITIVE	NEGATIVE	NEUTRAL
More concepts	It simplifies (2x)	Statistical
Shorter (2x)	Hard	
Faster (2x)	I miss some options	
Schematic	Complicated (some questions)	
More dynamic	2nd part: it's tiresome to retrieve the information (of the 1st part)	
Easier		
Clearer		
Clearer and concise (to the point)		
Original		
Concrete		
Thoughtful (3x)		
Useful (3x)		
Motivating		
Experiential		
Very good that they make us reflect on the experiences		
Introspective		
Self-analysis		
Space for reflection		
Stop to reflect		
Observation tool		
It promotes reflection on emotions		
Otherwise you'll never do it (analyze your emotions)		

ANNEX 2

THE PROFESSIONALS REFLECT ON THE EFFECTS OF USING THE TOOL

1. Has your pedagogical relationship with the person with severe DS changed since the start of the testing? If yes, could you explain which changes you've noticed?

- *Maybe a little. Now I pay more attention to the person and try to figure what he/she feels at that moment.*
- *Sincerely, no. I think my pedagogical relationship is the same.*
- *No*
- *No*
- *No*
- *The thing that has changed most is that, in front of specific situations, I've tried to think why it had happened. And I've tried to put myself in his/her shoes. And the fact of having to fill in the protocols has made me reflect. And that all has helped me to get closer to the person with DS I work with.*
- *Yes. It was a person with which I hadn't much relation or whom I paid no attention before. Thanks to this tool I've focused my attention on her and on what she did and felt. And also on the emotions and feelings she triggered in me. I think it has got us closer to each other.*
- *It hasn't changed that much. I think I'm more conscious of our relationship and of the aspects that prevent us from making progress, basically, because I didn't really listen to this person. But, I haven't felt many changes in the attitude. He's acting as always.*
- *Yes, they have changed because now I look at the person with other eyes. I'm not acting differently with him, but the analysis (self-observation) of these months has helped me to know him better, to question my interventions with him and to stop and try to understand him better.*

2. Do you think that using the tool has had any effect on your work, pedagogical relationship or way of working? If yes, please explain.

- *Now I understand myself better if I have a negative reaction, because I see that if I analyze it, I have an "excuse" and a constructive critic to myself.*
- *I have unconsciously created a space of reflection of my feelings when I intervene with the persons I work with. Before, my "essence" always came out. Now I ask myself why I did some things. I have questioned myself more things and I have shared them with the team of educators.*
- *Reflecting about the relational aspects of the educational fact has been something new for me. I'm not used to it. This fact, brings up some aspects that depend on me and that can be my responsibility. And it brings up an educational tool that can improve my relationships and my professional quality. We need strategies, tools, resources to know and change our emotions and feelings.*
- *Yes, I've reconsidered everything. I've asked myself if my way of acting was always the most adequate, above all in the educational relationship.*
- *Yes. I ask myself more, or it makes me think about what I would think or do if I was the other person, if the roles changed. In front of specific situations, I'm more aware and reflect about the thoughts and emotions of the person with DS and not only because it has to be done. You keep more in mind the opinion of the person you're working with.*
- *I think that, in general, I'm working in the same way I did before. But it's possible, that, specifically with this person, there has been a change in the relationship. But the rest has stayed the same.*
- *Yes, I think that it has made me pay more attention to my feelings. Especially in the more mechanical moments (at the dining room, the lavatories...) in which I wasn't that aware before. It has also made me aware of those negative feelings I usually didn't let out.*
- *Yes, it has changed. Not that much in the attitude of the person itself but more in the way I've intervened. That means, in the way I felt as a professional with him, in how I felt when he refused to do an activity. In short, it has helped me to reflect on the conflicts or difficult situations and, above all, to get conscious of the emotions that affect the educational relationship.*
- *Yes, I wasn't conscious, or conscious enough, of the fact that my emotions affect the relationship with the person. But I also think that I won't really do this analysis in my daily work, or, at least, in this deep and constant way. It would be great but I doubt I'll have enough time to do it.*

ANNEX 3

THE PROFESSIONALS SUGGEST FOR THE FUTURE IN RELATION TO THE TOOL

1. Would they use the tool in their work in the future?

- All 9 participants agree that they would use the tool in their work.
- Two of them think the initial tool was nicer to use. One says she likes more writing out the answers and she would take out questions 5 and 6.
- One person says she would use it individually. She doesn't think his/her team is enough open minded for this kind of tool.
- Three persons say that they would use it but now and then, not permanently or systematically. One says: only in situations that are really emotional intense. Another says: punctually and with a feedback of an external person (supervisions and advice on how to go on and to avoid getting stuck).

2. Would they recommend it as a tool in their organization?

- 8 of the 9 participants agree that they would recommend the use of the tool in their organization. One person doesn't know.
- Of this 8 persons, one thinks that it should be used but not systematically, another one thinks it should be introduced above all to people that start working in the organization, and another one thinks it should be used but only after a training.

3. How could it be introduced into the day-to-day work?

- There are different opinions about how the tool should be introduced in the day to day work. The answers are as follows:
 - o It should be introduced like until now: in the hours that you're not attending people.
 - o I don't know if it would be accepted.
 - o Saving some time in the team meetings to talk about feelings. The same time that is saved for supervisions. It would be nice to have the possibility to have a feedback from someone external and afterwards, with the team, trying to seek tools to manage emotions.
 - o A methodological tool to reflect in front of conflicts
 - o If you have a difficult case, you can use this tool to reflect, with advice of an external person.
 - o It's complicated. I think it should be simplified. Maybe it would be good to give a presentation to the whole team.
 - o Talking in team meetings about emotions and how we can manage them.
 - o Training the team and using the tool individually, but sharing the experiences.
 - o In our weekly meetings we usually have a space for reflection and training. Maybe it could be included in this space. But in a punctual way, not systematically.

ANNEX 4

THE PROFESSIONALS SUGGEST

Training:

- When is the best time to show the videos?
Some professionals think it would be good to show the videos during the first training, before starting using the self-observation protocols. Their opinion is that the videos have clarified what it's all about and the aspects they should focus on when using the tool. Other professionals, on the other hand, think it's good to show the videos during the second training, to avoid “biasing” the results of the self-observation.

The model

- They admit they haven't used the model. They haven't thought about the model when filling in the self-observation protocols. (*We think the proposed new protocol, allows them to focus more on the aspects of the model*)

The tools

- They would like to have access to the videos to share them with their colleagues and teams.
- We should define a minimum number of situations (first part of the new protocol) that have to be filled in to make the second part useful. (*A second option could be to fulfill the second part each lap of time (monthly, for instance))*
- It can be an idea to make a digital form that can be filled in via internet so that you can have an overview in the computer and don't have to search for the versions you filled in before.
- It's necessary to do some pre-work to enhance the importance of analyzing the own emotions, before you start using the protocols.
- The professionals missed the possibility to interact with the other professionals while using the tool, and having the possibility to exchange doubts and questions.